

**SEPARATION
OF
BLEND COMPONENTS**

PM3000984086

Source: <https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/rjmk0001>

TYPICAL CONCENTRATIONS OF COMPONENTS

Philip Morris

<u>Recon</u>	<u>ES</u>	<u>ET</u>
15% to 20%	0 to 10%	0 to 50%

R. J. Reynolds

<u>Recon</u>	<u>ES</u>	<u>ET</u>
15% to 25%	None	7% to 50%

Brown & Williamson

<u>Recon</u>	<u>ES</u>	<u>ET</u>
11% to 22%	0 to 14%	0 to 14%

Lorillard

<u>Recon</u>	<u>ES</u>	<u>ET</u>
15% to 22%	None	11% to 25%

American

<u>Recon</u>	<u>ES</u>	<u>ET</u>
20% to 25%	0 to 3%	12% to 50

Liggett

<u>Recon</u>	<u>ES</u>	<u>ET</u>
10% to 15%	5% to 13%	20% to 25%

TWO METHODS OF SEPARATION

Microscopic

- Components from center third of two cigarettes manually separated under microscope
- Fractions isolated and weighed
- Reported as Percent by Weight
- Routine method of analysis for RL, RCB, and ES
- Possible to separate combined small lamina/scrap

Acetone Floatation

- Filler from 18 cigarettes floated in 1L of acetone
- Floated and unfloated portions separated and dried
- Fractions are weighed
- Reported as Percent by Weight
- Routine method of analysis for ET

EVALUATION OF ROD TO ROD VARIATION OF BLEND COMPONENTS

Test was designed to:

- A. Determine the rod to rod variation of RL, RCB, ES, and ET
in IM #14 cigarettes**

- B. Determine the variation in the methods**

TEST DESIGN

A. RL, RCB, and ES were separated under the microscope by two subjects

Each subject picked the same 10 cigarettes

In addition each cigarette was re-picked by one subject

Results recorded by each subject

B. For ET, each subject evaluated 10 cigarettes from same population by the prescribed floatation method

Results recorded by each subject